1	Georgia A. Staton, Bar #004863 Elizabeth A. Gilbert, Bar #016498	
2	JONES, SKELTON & HOCHULI, P.L.C. 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 800	
3	Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Telephone: (602) 263-1752	
4	Fax: (602) 200-7854 gstaton@jshfirm.com	
5	egilbert@jshfirm.com minuteentries@jshfirm.com	
6	Attorneys for Defendants City of Phoenix;	
7	Richard L. Furman, II and Crystal F. Furman, husband and wife	
8	ANALES CELEBRA DAG	
9	UNITED STATES DIS	STRICT COURT
10 11	DISTRICT OF A	ARIZONA
12	Eduardo Herrera-Moreno,	NO.
13	Plaintiff,	NOTICE OF FILING REMOVAL
14	V.	
15	Richard Furman and Jane Doe Furman, husband and wife; City of Phoenix; John Does	
16	1-5; Jane Does 1-5; ABC Partnerships 1-5; and XYZ Corporations 1-5,	
17	Defendants.	
18		
19	Defendants City of Phoenix, Rich	ard L. Furman, II and Crystal F. Furman,
20	by and through undersigned counsel and pursuan	nt to 28 U.S.C.§ 1441(b) have been served
21	via Acceptance of Service with Plaintiff's Com	plaint, and hereby notices the removal of
22	the above-captioned case, Maricopa County Su	perior Court Cause No. CV2012-011467
23	from the Arizona Superior Court, County of Mar	ricopa, to this Court and in support thereof
24	asserts:	
25		s of unlawful use of force in violation of
26	the 4 th and 14 th Amendments to the United Sta	ates Constitution and violation of the 1st
27	Amendment to the United States Constitution.	
28	2950692.1 9/10/12	

1	2. On or about August 8, 2012, Plaintiff filed a Complaint against the
2	City of Phoenix, Richard L. Furman, II and Jane Doe Furman his spouse, in the Superior
3	Court of the State of Arizona in and for the County of Maricopa, under the caption,
4	Eduardo Herrera-Moreno v. Richard Furman and Jane Doe Furman and City of Phoenix
5	et al. CV2012-011467. A copy of the Complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit "A."
6	Defendants City of Phoenix and Richard L. Furman, II and Crystal F. Furman (spouse)
7	received formal notice of the Complaint on or about August 23, 2012 and August 21,
8	2012, respectively when they were served with the Summons and Complaint.
9	3. This Notice of Removal is being filed within thirty days after initial
10	service of the Complaint and is therefore timely filed under 28 U.S.C.§ 1446(b).
11	4. Copies of all remaining pleadings currently on file with the Maricopa
12	County Superior Court are attached as part of Exhibit "B."
13	A Notice of Filing Notice of Removal, a true and correct copy of which is
14	attached as Exhibit "C" (without exhibits attached) has been filed in the Arizona Superior
15	Court, County of Maricopa, on behalf of Defendants City of Phoenix, Richard L. Furman,
16	II and Crystal F. Furman.
17	Defendants City of Phoenix, Richard L. Furman, II and Crystal F. Furman
18	respectfully request that the above action now pending in Arizona Superior Court,
19	Maricopa County, be removed to this Court.
20	DATED this 9 th day of September, 2012.
21	JONES, SKELTON & HOCHULI, P.L.C.
22	
23	By s/Georgia A. Staton
24	Georgia A. Staton Elizabeth A. Gilbert
25	2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 800 Phoenix, Arizona 85012
26	Attorneys for Defendants City of Phoenix; Richard L. Furman, II and Crystal F.
27	Furman, husband and wife
28	2050602.1
	2950692.1

9/10/12

1	ORIGINAL of the foregoing e-filed
2	this 9 th day of September, 2012.
3	COPY of the foregoing mailed this 9 th day of September, 2012, to:
4	Hon. Michael Herrod
5	Maricopa County Superior Court East Court Building - 411
6	101 West Jefferson Street Phoenix, AZ 85003
7	602-372-0359
8	Augustine B. Jimenez, III, Esq. MONTOYA JIMENEZ, P.A.
9	3200 North Central Avenue Suite 2550
10	Phoenix, AZ 85012-2490 602-263-7875
11	E-mail: Attorney@ABJLaw.com
12	Jose A. Saldivar, Esq. JOSE A. SALDIVAR, P.C.
13	3200 North Central Avenue Suite 2550
14	Phoenix, AZ 85012 602-999-7876
15	E-mail: Jose @SaldivarLaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff
16	s/Gwen Coon
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	2950692.1 9/10/12

EXHIBIT "A"

1 AUGUSTINE B. JIMENEZ III State Bar # 012208 2 Montoya Jimenez, P.A. 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2490 602-263-7875 AUG - 8 2012 3 Attorney@ABJLaw.com **DEPUTY CLERK** 5 JOSE A. SALDIVAR State Bar # 022991 Jose A. Saldivar, P.C. 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 7 Phoenix, Arizona 85012 602-999-7876 Jose@SaldivarLaw.com 8 9 Attorneys for Plaintiff 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA 12 EDUARDO HERRERA-MORENO. CV2012 01145 No. 13 Plaintiff, 14 **COMPLAINT** VS. 15 (Tort – Non-Motor Vehicle, RICHARD FURMAN and JANE DOE Negligence) 16 FURMAN, husband and wife; CITY OF PHOENIX; JOHN DOES 1-5; JANE 17 DOES 1-5; ABC PARTNERSHIPS 1-5: 18 and XYZ CORPORATIONS 1-5; 19 Defendants. 20 21 Plaintiff, for his Complaint against Defendants, alleges as follows: 22 At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff was a resident of Maricopa 1. 23 County, Arizona. All actions, transactions, omissions and occurrences complained 24 of herein, occurred within said County and State. 25 2. Upon information and belief, at all times mentioned herein, 26 defendants Richard Furman and Jane Doe Furman were residents of Maricopa

County, Arizona, and caused events to occur in the County of Maricopa, in the

27

28

.

State of Arizona, out of which these claims arise. All acts of Defendant Richard Furman were in furtherance of his community and marital estate.

- 3. Defendant City of Phoenix is a body politic in the State of Arizona; Defendant Officer Richard Furman (Officer Furman) is a peace officer with the Phoenix Police Department. The Defendants caused events to occur in Maricopa County, and within the jurisdiction of this Court.
- 4. Defendants' acts were committed under color of state or local law. Defendant Officer Furman is being sued in both his individual and official capacities. His actions complained of herein were done within the course and scope of his employment with the City of Phoenix that is therefore vicariously liable for Officer Furman's conduct. Jane Doe Furman, as a member of her marital community, is also liable for the conduct of her husband, Defendant Officer Furman.
- 5. The fictitiously named defendants are entities or persons, partnerships, corporations, unincorporated associations, bodies politic and public agencies subject to suit in a common name whose names are unknown to Plaintiff and who are, therefore, designated by fictitious names pursuant to Rule 10(f), Rules of Civil Procedure. Each of these Defendants caused Plaintiff's injuries and is liable to Plaintiff or is responsible as a matter of law for acts of others who caused Plaintiff's injuries.
- 6. All Defendants are hereby sued in their individual and official capacities. Defendants at all times herein mentioned were the agents, employees, partners and co-conspirators of their co-defendants and in doing these things herein alleged were acting within the course and scope of such agency, employment, partnership and conspiracy with the permission and consent of their co-defendants. The actions of Defendants herein alleged were taken in furtherance of official policies, customs, procedures and authority.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 7. On August 12, 2011, On August 12, 2011, at approximately 4:45 a.m., Plaintiff, was arrested for alleged criminal damage at 1647 W. Atlanta Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona. The alleged criminal damage was a broken window (valued at \$50.00) at his friend's house. Plaintiff suffers from a physical disability. More specifically, his right arm is deformed and substantially shorter than his left arm. This disability is readily apparent and visible to anyone making contact with him. Moreover, Officer Furman was familiar with Plaintiff and was fully aware of Plaintiff's disability. As the officer began to physically restrain him, Plaintiff informed him of his disability and pled for him not to handcuff him behind his back because of his arm. Plaintiff did not resist arrest, was unarmed, and did not present any threat to police officers. Notwithstanding, Officer Furman, forced Plaintiff's right arm back behind his back, causing his right arm to break. Although Plaintiff's arm hurt, he was not fully aware of the extent of his injury until he was released from the Maricopa County Jail and presented at the hospital.
 - 8. The charges against Plaintiff were dismissed on September 27, 2011.
- 9. As a result of the injuries suffered by Plaintiff, he underwent surgery to repair his broken arm. In addition, Plaintiff is currently being evaluated for additional surgery due to the nerve damage caused by the injury as well as the ongoing pain and numbness to his right hand. As a result of Officer Furman's negligence, Plaintiff has endured great pain and suffering including post-surgery recovery which he may have to endure again.

COUNT ONE (Assault/Intentional Tort)

- 10. Plaintiff hereby incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.
- 11. That the conduct of Officer Furman constitutes assault and aggravated assault. That the assault was the proximate cause of the injuries and medical

-3

expenses suffered and incurred by Plaintiff. That Officer Furman's actions were in a fashion or means likely to result in grievous bodily harm.

COUNT TWO (Excessive/Improper Use of Force)

- 12. Plaintiff hereby incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.
- 13. This count is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 and the First, Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.
- 14. That Officer Furman's actions, as set forth above, were in violation of Plaintiff's constitutional rights in that the officer's conduct was an excessive and improper use of force.

COUNT THREE (Negligence/Gross Negligence)

- 15. Plaintiff hereby incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.
- 16. That Officer Furman owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care in effecting his arrest;, that Defendant breached this duty of reasonable care by acting unreasonably, grossly negligent and with conscious disregard for the health, safety and rights of Plaintiff; that these breaches proximately caused serious injury to Plaintiff in violation of his statutory and constitutional rights.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants and each and every one of them as follows:

- 1. For an amount to be proven at trial which will reasonably and fairly compensate Plaintiff for personal injuries and for current and future medical expenses and loss of income;
- 2. For an amount to be proven at trial which will reasonably and fairly compensate Plaintiff for pain, suffering and humiliation;
 - 3. For punitive damages;
 - 4. For Plaintiff's costs and attorneys' fees as allowed by law; and
 - 5. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Dated this 7th day of August, 2012.

MONTOYA HENEZ, P.A.

Augustine B. Jimenez III 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2490

JOSE A. SALDIVAR, P.C. Jose A. Saldivar 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012

Attorneys for Plaintiff

-5

a alog a true of N

EXHIBIT "B"

Case 2:12-cv-01905-JWS Document 1-1 Filed 09/10/12 P

Document Distribution: Original - Give to E ee copy - Place in Note. A on Desk

Copy - Attach to Summons/Complaint

Pag	MATTER NO.:
	12-120204

CITY OF PHOENIX LAW DEPARTMENT — CIVIL DIVISION Complaint Receipt Information						
LAWSUIT	LAWSUIT INFORMATION:					
Plaintiff(s) Name: EDUARDO HERRERA - MORENO						
Defendant(s) Name: Richard L	Defendant(s) Name:					
Court: ⊠Superior Court ☐ Federal Court ☐	Justice	Number: (NaO12-011467				
Name of Plaintiff's Attorney: Augustine	inenez III	Jose Saldivar				
Method of Service: ☐ Process Server ☐ Ma	· —	Mail Other:				
Date Served: Where Served:	Ŋ.,~	Person Served:				
8/21/12 400 w Southern	· Hve E INFORMATION					
D. A.Div. of	<u> </u>					
Dept./Div. of Person Served: DHX P.D. / SMP	Phone No.	602-540-8857				
Office or Job Site 400 w Southern Ave	Job Title:	Police Officer				
Current Supervisor: D. Montoya	Job Title of Curre Supervisor:	nt Sergeant				
Phone Number of	Address of Supervisor:	400 w Southern Av.				
Supervisor on Bate of	Job Assignment					
Incident: WWK Is There a Report of	If Yes, Date of Re					
This Incident: Current Marital Status:		Current Spouse's Name:				
☐ Single Married ☐ Divorced	Crystal.					
Marital Status on Date of Incident:		of Spouse on Date of Incident:				
☐ Single Married ☐ Divorced	Crystal	Fruman				
	R EMPLOYED BY	Y CITY				
Current Employer:	Job Title:					
Address:	Phone Number					
>>> WRITE ANY ADDITIONAL IN	FORMATION ON	N REVERSE SIDE				
FORM RECEIVED BY: Shallen & Beatty DATE: 8/22/12						

THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ON THIS FORM IS CONSIDERED ATTORNEY-CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION AND WILL NOT BE RELEASED EXCEPT PURSUANT TO A SPECIFIC COURT ORDER. IT IS EXPEMPT FROM PUBLIC RECORDS OR PUBLIC INFORMATION DISCLOSURE.

CITY OF PHOENIX 1 AUGUSTINE B. JIMENEZ III 2012 AUG 22 AH 8: 54 State Bar # 012208 Montoya Jimenez, P.A. 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2490 2 CITY ATTURNEYS OFFICE 3 602-263-7875 4 Attorney@ABJLaw.com JOSE A. SALDIVAR State Bar # 022991 Jose A. Saldivar, P.C. 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 5 6 Phoenix, Arizona 85012 602-999-7876 7 8 Jose@SaldivarLaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff 9 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA 12 EDUARDO HERRERA-MORENO, NoCV2012 011467 13 Plaintiff, 14 **SUMMONS** VS. 15 (Tort – Non-Motor Vehicle, RICHARD FURMAN and JANE DOE Negligence) 16 FURMAN, husband and wife; CITY OF 17 PHOENIX; JOHN DOES 1-5; JANE If you would like legal edvice from a lawyer, DOES 1-5; ABC PARTNERSHIPS 1-5; contact the Lawyer Referral Service ca 18 and XYZ CORPORATIONS 1-5; G02-257-4434 19 C/ unni lengerfindere, ere Defendants. 20 Synthong by the 21 THE STATE OF ARIZONA TO: 22 RICHARD FURMAN and JANE DOE FURMAN, husband and wife CITY OF PHOENIX 23 JOHN DOES 1-5; JANE DOES 1-5 24 ABC PARTNERSHIPS 1-5; and XYZ CORPORATIONS 1-5 25 YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to appear and defend, within the time 26 applicable, in this action in this Court. If served within Arizona, you shall appear and defend within 20 days after the service of the Summons and Complaint or Petition for Dissolution of 27 Marriage upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If served out of the State of Arizona – 28 whether by direct service, by registered or certified mail, or by publication – you shall appear and defend within 30 days after the service of the Summons and Complaint upon you is

Case 2:12-cv-01905-JWS Document 1-1 Filed 09/10/12 Page 9 of 28

PECEIVED

-1-

complete, exclusive of the day of service. Where process service is upon the Arizona Director of Insurance as an insurer's attorney to receive service of legal process against it in this state, the insurer shall not be required to appear, answer or plead until expiration of 40 days after date of such service upon the Director. Service by registered or certified mail without the State of Arizona is complete 30 days after the date of filing the receipt and affidavit of service with the Court. Service by publication is complete 30 days after the date of first publication. Direct service is complete when made. Service upon the Arizona Motor Vehicle Superintendent is complete 30 days after filing the Affidavit of Compliance and return receipt or Officer's return. RCP 4; A.R.S. Sections 20-222, 28-502, 28-503.

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that in case of your failure to appear and defend within the time applicable, judgment by default may be rendered against you for the relief demanded in the Complaint.

YOU ARE CAUTIONED that in order to appear and defend, you must file an Answer or proper response in writing with the Clerk of this Court, accompanied by the necessary filing fee, within the time required, and you are required to serve a copy of any Answer or response upon the Plaintiff's attorney. RCP 10(d); ARS Section 12-311; RCP 5.

Requests for reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities must be made to the division assigned to the case by parties at least 3 judicial days in advance of a scheduled court proceeding.

The name and address of Petitioner's attorney is:

AUGUSTINE B. JIMENEZ III
3200 N. Central, Suite 2550
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

SIGNED AND SEALED this date:	
	CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

y: AUG - 8 2012

Deputy Clerk SEAL MICHAEL K. JEANES, CLERK P. SANDERS DEPUTY CLERK

CITY CLERK DEPT. AUGUSTINE B. JIMENEZ III State Bar # 012208 Montoya Jimenez, P.A. 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2490 602-263-7875 1 2017 AUG 23 AM 11: 43 2 3 4 Attorney@ABJLaw.com JOSE A. SALDIVAR State Bar # 022991 Jose A. Saldivar, P.C. 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 5 6 Phoenix, Arizona 85012 602-999-7876 7 8 Jose@SaldivarLaw.com 9 Attorneys for Plaintiff 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA 12 EDUARDO HERRERA-MORENO, No. CV2012 011467 13 Plaintiff, 14 **SUMMONS** vs. 15 (Tort - Non-Motor Vehicle, RICHARD FURMAN and JANE DOE Negligence) 16 FURMAN, husband and wife; CITY OF PHOENIX; JOHN DOES 1-5; JANE 17 If you would like legal advice from a lawyer. DOES 1-5; ABC PARTNERSHIPS 1-5; contact the Lawyer Referral Service at 18 and XYZ CORPORATIONS 1-5; 602-257-4434 19 www.iswyorfinders.org. Defendants. 20 Sponsored by the 21 Marianero Courty Har Accostation THE STATE OF ARIZONA TO: 22 RICHARD FURMAN and JANE DOE FURMAN, husband and wife 23 CITY OF PHOENIX JOHN DOES 1-5; JANE DOES 1-5 24 ABC PARTNERSHIPS 1-5; and XYZ CORPORATIONS 1-5 25 YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to appear and defend, within the time 26 applicable, in this action in this Court. If served within Arizona, you shall appear and defend within 20 days after the service of the Summons and Complaint or Petition for Dissolution of 27 Marriage upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If served out of the State of Arizona – 28 whether by direct service, by registered or certified mail, or by publication - you shall appear and defend within 30 days after the service of the Summons and Complaint upon you is

-1-

Case 2:12-cv-01905-JWS Document 1-1 Filed 09/10/12 Page 12 of 28 03/10/12

complete, exclusive of the day of service. Where process service is upon the Arizona Director of Insurance as an insurer's attorney to receive service of legal process against it in this state, the insurer shall not be required to appear, answer or plead until expiration of 40 days after date of such service upon the Director. Service by registered or certified mail without the State of Arizona is complete 30 days after the date of filing the receipt and affidavit of service with the Court. Service by publication is complete 30 days after the date of first publication. Direct service is complete when made. Service upon the Arizona Motor Vehicle Superintendent is complete 30 days after filing the Affidavit of Compliance and return receipt or Officer's return. RCP 4; A.R.S. Sections 20-222, 28-502, 28-503.

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that in case of your failure to appear and defend within the time applicable, judgment by default may be rendered against you for the relief demanded in the Complaint.

YOU ARE CAUTIONED that in order to appear and defend, you must file an Answer or proper response in writing with the Clerk of this Court, accompanied by the necessary filing fee, within the time required, and you are required to serve a copy of any Answer or response upon the Plaintiff's attorney. RCP 10(d); ARS Section 12-311; RCP 5.

Requests for reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities must be made to the division assigned to the case by parties at least 3 judicial days in advance of a scheduled court proceeding.

The name and address of Petitioner's attorney is:

AUGUSTINE B. JIMENEZ III 3200 N. Central, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012

SIGNED	AND	SEALED	this date:	•		

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

Ву:		-	AUG - 8 2012	
	Deputy	Clerk	MICHAEL K. JEANES, CLI	ERM
		A STATE OF	R SANDERS DEPUTY CLERK	

1 AUGUSTINE B. JIMENEZ III State Bar # 012208 Montoya Jimenez, P.A. 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2490 2 3 602-263-7875 4 Attorney@ABJLaw.com JOSE A. SALDIVAR State Bar # 022991 5 Jose A. Saldivar, P.C. 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012 7 602-999-7876 8 Jose@SaldivarLaw.com 9 Attorneys for Plaintiff 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA 12 EDUARDO HERRERA-MORENO, CV2012 011467 No. 13 Plaintiff, 14 **COMPLAINT** VS. 15 (Tort – Non-Motor Vehicle, RICHARD FURMAN and JANE DOE Negligence) 16 FURMAN, husband and wife; CITY OF 17 PHOENIX; JOHN DOES 1-5; JANE DOES 1-5; ABC PARTNERSHIPS 1-5; 18 and XYZ CORPORATIONS 1-5; 19 Defendants. 20 21 Plaintiff, for his Complaint against Defendants, alleges as follows: 22 At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff was a resident of Maricopa 1. 23 County, Arizona. All actions, transactions, omissions and occurrences complained 24 of herein, occurred within said County and State. 25 Upon information and belief, at all times mentioned herein, 2. 26 defendants Richard Furman and Jane Doe Furman were residents of Maricopa 27 County, Arizona, and caused events to occur in the County of Maricopa, in the

AUG - 8 2012

Mighael K. Jeanes, Gl**erk** P. Sandeng DEPUTY CLERK

28

State of Arizona, out of which these claims arise. All acts of Defendant Richard Furman were in furtherance of his community and marital estate.

- 3. Defendant City of Phoenix is a body politic in the State of Arizona; Defendant Officer Richard Furman (Officer Furman) is a peace officer with the Phoenix Police Department. The Defendants caused events to occur in Maricopa County, and within the jurisdiction of this Court.
- 4. Defendants' acts were committed under color of state or local law. Defendant Officer Furman is being sued in both his individual and official capacities. His actions complained of herein were done within the course and scope of his employment with the City of Phoenix that is therefore vicariously liable for Officer Furman's conduct. Jane Doe Furman, as a member of her marital community, is also liable for the conduct of her husband, Defendant Officer Furman.
- 5. The fictitiously named defendants are entities or persons, partnerships, corporations, unincorporated associations, bodies politic and public agencies subject to suit in a common name whose names are unknown to Plaintiff and who are, therefore, designated by fictitious names pursuant to Rule 10(f), Rules of Civil Procedure. Each of these Defendants caused Plaintiff's injuries and is liable to Plaintiff or is responsible as a matter of law for acts of others who caused Plaintiff's injuries.
- 6. All Defendants are hereby sued in their individual and official capacities. Defendants at all times herein mentioned were the agents, employees, partners and co-conspirators of their co-defendants and in doing these things herein alleged were acting within the course and scope of such agency, employment, partnership and conspiracy with the permission and consent of their co-defendants. The actions of Defendants herein alleged were taken in furtherance of official policies, customs, procedures and authority.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

: Pr. . . .

- 7. On August 12, 2011, On August 12, 2011, at approximately 4:45 a.m., Plaintiff, was arrested for alleged criminal damage at 1647 W. Atlanta Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona. The alleged criminal damage was a broken window (valued at \$50.00) at his friend's house. Plaintiff suffers from a physical disability. More specifically, his right arm is deformed and substantially shorter than his left arm. This disability is readily apparent and visible to anyone making contact with him. Moreover, Officer Furman was familiar with Plaintiff and was fully aware of Plaintiff's disability. As the officer began to physically restrain him, Plaintiff informed him of his disability and pled for him not to handcuff him behind his back because of his arm. Plaintiff did not resist arrest, was unarmed, and did not present any threat to police officers. Notwithstanding, Officer Furman, forced Plaintiff's right arm back behind his back, causing his right arm to break. Although Plaintiff's arm hurt, he was not fully aware of the extent of his injury until he was released from the Maricopa County Jail and presented at the hospital.
 - 8. The charges against Plaintiff were dismissed on September 27, 2011.
- 9. As a result of the injuries suffered by Plaintiff, he underwent surgery to repair his broken arm. In addition, Plaintiff is currently being evaluated for additional surgery due to the nerve damage caused by the injury as well as the ongoing pain and numbness to his right hand. As a result of Officer Furman's negligence, Plaintiff has endured great pain and suffering including post-surgery recovery which he may have to endure again.

COUNT ONE (Assault/Intentional Tort)

- 10. Plaintiff hereby incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.
- 11. That the conduct of Officer Furman constitutes assault and aggravated assault. That the assault was the proximate cause of the injuries and medical

13 14

16 17

15

18

19 20

22

21

24

23

25 26

27

28

expenses suffered and incurred by Plaintiff. That Officer Furman's actions were in a fashion or means likely to result in grievous bodily harm.

COUNT TWO (Excessive/Improper Use of Force)

- 12. Plaintiff hereby incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.
- 13. This count is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 and the First, Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.
- 14. That Officer Furman's actions, as set forth above, were in violation of Plaintiff's constitutional rights in that the officer's conduct was an excessive and improper use of force.

COUNT THREE (Negligence/Gross Negligence)

- 15. Plaintiff hereby incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.
- 16. That Officer Furman owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care in effecting his arrest;, that Defendant breached this duty of reasonable care by acting unreasonably, grossly negligent and with conscious disregard for the health, safety and rights of Plaintiff; that these breaches proximately caused serious injury to Plaintiff in violation of his statutory and constitutional rights.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants and each and every one of them as follows:

- For an amount to be proven at trial which will reasonably and fairly compensate Plaintiff for personal injuries and for current and future medical expenses and loss of income;
- For an amount to be proven at trial which will reasonably and fairly 2. compensate Plaintiff for pain, suffering and humiliation;
 - For punitive damages; 3.
 - 4. For Plaintiff's costs and attorneys' fees as allowed by law; and
 - For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. 5.

JAMAN CARL SE

Dated this 7th day of August, 2012.

3 ·

R

MONTOYA HMENEZ, P.A.

Augustine B. Jimenez III 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2490

JOSE A. SALDIVAR, P.C. Jose A. Saldivar 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012

Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 AUGUSTINE B. JIMENEZ III State Bar # 012208
Montoya Jimenez, P.A.
3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2490 2 AUG - 8 2012 3 MICHAEL K. JEANES, CLERK 602-263-7875 Attorney@ABJLaw.com P SANDERS DEPUTY CLERK 4 JOSE A. SALDIVAR State Bar # 022991 Jose A. Saldivar, P.C. 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 5 6 7 Phoenix, Arizona 85012 602-999-7876 8 Jose@SaldivarLaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff 9 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA 12 EDUARDO HERRERA-MORENO, CV2012 011467 No. 13 Plaintiff, CERTIFICATE OF COMPULSORY 14 VS. 15 ARBITRATION RICHARD FURMAN and JANE DOE 16 FURMAN, husband and wife; CITY OF PHOENIX; JOHN DOES 1-5; JANE 17 DOES 1-5; ABC PARTNERSHIPS 1-5; 18 and XYZ CORPORATIONS 1-5; 19 Defendants. 20 21 22 The undersigned certifies that he knows the dollar limits and any other 23 limitations set forth by the local rules of practice for the Maricopa County 24 Superior Court, and further certifies that this case is not subject to compulsory 25 arbitration, as provided by Rules 72 through 76 of the Arizona Rules of Civil 26 Procedure. 27 ///

28

///

Magazine

Markey C

Dated this 7th day of August, 2012.

MONTOYA HMENEZ, P.A.

Augustine B. Jimenez III
3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2490

JOSE A. SALDIVAR, P.C. Jose A. Saldivar 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Arty All a 1 2-

1 AUGUSTINE B. JIMENEZ III State Bar # 012208 2 Montoya Jimenez, P.A. AUG - 8 2012 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2490 602-263-7875 3 MICHAEL K. JEANES, CLERK 4 Attorney@ABJLaw.com 5 JOSE A. SALDIVAR State Bar # 022991 Jose A. Saldivar, P.C. 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012 602-999-7876 7 Jose@SaldivarLaw.com 8 9 Attorneys for Plaintiff 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA 12 EDUARDO HERRERA-MORENO, No. CV2012 011467 13 Plaintiff, 14 VS. COMPULSORY 15 ARBITRATION RICHARD FURMAN and JANE DOE 16 FURMAN, husband and wife; CITY OF PHOENIX; JOHN DOES 1-5; JANE 17 DOES 1-5; ABC PARTNERSHIPS 1-5; 18 and XYZ CORPORATIONS 1-5; 19 Defendants. 20 21 22 The undersigned certifies that he knows the dollar limits and any other limitations set forth by the local rules of practice for the Maricopa County 23 24 Superior Court, and further certifies that this case is not subject to compulsory 25 arbitration, as provided by Rules 72 through 76 of the Arizona Rules of Civil 26 Procedure. 27 /// 28 ///

Dated this 7th day of August, 2012.

Maria

MONTOYA JIMENEZ, P.A.

Augustine B. Jimenez III
3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2490

JOSE A. SALDIVAR, P.C. Jose A. Saldivar 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2550 Phoenix, Arizona 85012

Attorneys for Plaintiff

-2-

EXHIBIT "C"

- 1		
1	Georgia A. Staton, Bar #004863 Elizabeth A. Gilbert, Bar #016498	
2	JONES, SKELTON & HOCHULI, P.L.C. 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 800	
3	Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Telephone: (602) 263-1752	
4	Fax: (602) 200-7854 gstaton@jshfirm.com	
5	egilbert@jshfirm.com minuteentries@jshfirm.com	
6	Attorneys for Defendants City of Phoenix;	
7	Richard L. Furman, II and Crystal F. Furman, husband and wife	
8		
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	STATE OF ARIZONA
10	COUNTY OF M	ARICOPA
11	Eduardo Herrera-Moreno,	NO. CV2012-011467
12	Plaintiff,	NOTICE OF REMOVAL TO UNITED STATES DISTRICT
13	v. Richard Furman and Jane Doe Furman,	COURT
14 15	husband and wife; City of Phoenix; John Does 1-5; Jane Does 1-5; ABC Partnerships 1-5; and XYZ Corporations 1-5,	(Assigned to the Honorable Michael Herrod, ECB-411)
16	Defendants.	
17	Defendants City of Phoenix, Rich	ard L. Furman II and Crystal F. Furman,
18	by and through undersigned counsel, pursuant	to 28 U.S.C. § 1441, et seq. notify this
19	Court that it filed a Notice of Removal of this ac	tion to the United States District Court for
20	the District of Arizona. A copy of the Notice	ce of Removal (exclusive of exhibits) is
21	attached as Exhibit "A."	
22		
23		
24		
25		
2627		
28		
۷۵	2950690.1 9/7/12	

ľ	
1	DATED this 9^{+2} day of September, 2012.
2	JONES, SKELTON & HOCHULI, P.L.C.
3	7 [1
4	By Georgia Al Staton
5	Elizabeth A. Gilbert 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 800
6	Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Attorneys for Defendants City of Phoenix;
7	Richard L. Furman, II and Crystal F. Furman, husband and wife
8	1 012
9	ORIGINAL of the foregoing e-filed
10	this 9 ¹² day of September, 2012.
11	COPY of the foregoing mailed this $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ day of September, 2012, to:
12	Hon. Michael Herrod
13	Maricopa County Superior Court East Court Building - 411
14	101 West Jefferson Street Phoenix, AZ 85003
15	602-372-0359
16	Augustine B. Jimenez, III, Esq. MONTOYA JIMENEZ, P.A.
17	3200 North Central Avenue Suite 2550
18	Phoenix, AZ 85012-2490 602-263-7875
19	E-mail: Attorney@ABJLaw.com
20	Jose A. Saldivar, Esq. JOSE A. SALDIVAR, P.C.
21	3200 North Central Avenue Suite 2550
22	Phoenix, AZ 85012 602-999-7876
23	E-mail: Jose @SaldivarLaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff
24	(Jeven Loon)
25	
26	
27	

2950690.1 9/7/12 2

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by aw, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS:		DEFENDANTS: Richard Furman			
I EDUARDO HERR	ERA-MORENO,	Phoenix; John Does 1-5; Jane Does 1-5; ABC Partnerships 1-5 and XYZ Corporations 1-5			
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDE (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLA	NCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF Maricopa AINTIFF CASES)	COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LIS' (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CAS			
Augustine B. Jiminez, III, Esc MONTOYA JIMENEZ, P.A. 3200 North Central Avenue, S Phoenix, AZ 85012-2490 602-263-7875 E-mail: Attorney@ABJlaw.c. Jose A. Saldivar, Esq. JOSE A SALDIVAR, P.C. 3200 North Central Avenue, S Phoenix, AZ 85012 602-999-7876 E-mail: Jose@SaldivarLaw.c	Suite 2550 Suite 2550 Suite 2550	ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN) Georgia A. Staton, #004863 Elizabeth A. Gilbert, #016498 Jones, Skelton & Hochuli, P.L.C. 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite Phoenix, AZ 85012 Attorneys for Defendant City of Ph. Telephone No.: (602) 263-1752 FAX: 602-200-7854 E-mail: gstaton@jshfirm.com			
Attorneys for Plaintiff					
II. BASIS OF JURIS	SDICTION (PLACE AN X IN ONE BOX ONLY)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL (FOR DIVERSITY CASES ONLY)		ONE .ND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT	
9 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff9 2 U.S. Government Defendant	 X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties In Item III) 	PTF Citizen of this State 9 1 Citizen of another State 9 2 Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	DEF Incorporated or Princ Of Business in this S Incorporated and Prin Of Business in Anoth	State ncipal Place	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (PL	ACE AN X IN ONE BOX ONLY)				
CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
110 Insurance 9 120 Marine 9 130 Miller Act 9 140 Negotiable Instrument 9 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 9 151 Medicare Act 9 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl Veterans) 9 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 9 160 Stockholders' Suits 9 190 Other Contract 9 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 9 210 Land Condemnation 9 220 Foreclosure 9 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 9 240 Torts to Land 9 245 Tort Product Liability 9 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY 9 310 Airplane 9 315 Airplane 9 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 9 330 Federal Employers' Liability 9 340 Marine 9 345 Marine Product Liability 9 350 Motor Vehicle 9 355 Motor Vehicle 9 70 Other Personal Injury 9 360 Other Personal Product Liability 9 371 Truth in Lendin 9 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 9 360 Other Personal Product Liability 9 370 Other Fraud 9 375 Property Dama 9 385 Property Dama Product Liability 9 360 Other Personal Paparty 9 370 Motions to Vac Sentence 441 Voting 442 Employment 442 Housing/ Accommodations 9 530 General	9 620 Other Food & Drug 9 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 9 630 Liquor Laws 9 640 R.R. & Truck 9 650 Airline Regs 9 660 Occupational Safety/Health 9 690 Other LABOR	9 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 9 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 9 820 Copyrights 9 830 Patent 9 840 Trademarks SOCIAL SECURITY 9 861 HIA (1395ff) 9 862 Black Lung (923) 9 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 9 864 SSID Title XVI 9 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 9 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant 9 871 IRS - Third Party	9 400 State Reapportionment 9 410 Antitrust 9 430 Banks and Banking 9 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 9 460 Deportation 9 470 Racketeer Influenced \$ Corrupt Organizations 9 810 Selective Service 9 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 9 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 9 891 Agricultural Acts 9 892 Economic Stabilization Act 9 893 Environmental Matters 9 894 Energy Allocation Act 9 895 Freedom of Information Act 9 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 9 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
9 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations 9 535 General 9 535 Death Penalty 2 440 Other Civil Rights 9 540 Mandamus & C 9 550 Other	Other		9 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 9 890 Other Statutory Actions	

V. ORIGIN (PLACE AN X IN ONE BOX ONLY) APPEAL TO 9 1 Original from Magistrate Proceeding Judgment TRANSFERRED FROM DISTRICT JUDGE X .2 94 96 Multidistrict 9 7 Removed from Remanded from Reinstated or 95 another district State Court Appellate Court Reopened (Specify) Litigation

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE A BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE. DO NOT CITE JURISDICTIONAL STATUTES UNLESS DIVERSITY.)

Unlawful arrest and seizure under the 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and denial of Equal Protection.

VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$ CHECK YES ONLY IF I	No DEMANDE	Demand D IN COMPLAI	NT:
COMPLAINT 9 UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	JURY DEMAND:	YE	s	NO
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (SEE INSTRUCTIONS): IF ANY NONE				
DATE SEPTEMBER 9, 2012. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD	<u>S/GEORGIA A. STATON</u> Georgia A. Staton			

SUPPLEMENTAL CIVIL COVER SHEET FOR CASES REMOVED FROM ANOTHER JURISDICTION

This form must be attached to the Civil Cover Sheet at the time the case is filed in the United States District Clerk's Office.

Additional sheets may be used as necessary.

1. Style of the Case:

Please include all Plaintiff(s), Defendant(s), Intervenor(s), Counterclaimant(s), Crossclaimant(s) and Third Party Claimant(s) still remaining in the case and indicate their party type. Also, please list the attorney(s) of record for each party named and include their bar number, firm name, correct mailing address, and phone number (including area code).

Eduaro	<u>Party</u> do Herrera-Moreno	Party Type Plaintiff	_		menez, III r
City of Phoenix, Richard L. Furman, and Crystal F. Furman		, II Defendants	Georgia A. Staton Elizabeth A. Gilbert		
2.	Jury Demand:				
	Was a Jury Demand made in another jurisdiction?			Yes	<u>X</u> No
	If "Yes," by which party and on what date?				
3.	Answer:				
	Was an Answer made in anot	ther jurisdiction?		Yes	No X
	If "Yes," by which pa	arty and on what date?			

4. Served Parties:

The following parties have been served at the time this case was removed:

<u>Party</u>	<u>Date Served</u>	Method of Service
Richard L. Furman, II and Crystal F. Furman, husband and wife	August 21, 2012	Process Server
City of Phoenix	August 23, 2012	Process Server

5. Unserved Parties:

The following parties have not been served at the time this case was removed:

Party Reason Not Served

6. Nonsuited, Dismissed or Terminated Parties:

Please indicate changes from the style of the papers from another jurisdiction and the reason for the change:

Party Reason for Change

7. Claims of the Parties:

The filing party submits the following summary of the remaining claims of each party in this litigation:

Party Claim(s)

Plaintiff

Use of excessive force in violation of the

1st, 4th and 14th Amendments to the

United States Constitution.

Pursuant to 28 USC § 1446(a) a copy of all process, pleadings, and orders served in another jurisdiction (State court) shall be filed with this removal.